



CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH GENERAL PLAN/LCP IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

ACTION MINUTES

Action Minutes of the General Plan/LCP Implementation Committee held at the City Council Chambers, City of Newport Beach, on **Wednesday, March 17, 2010**

Members Present:

X	Ed Selich, Mayor, Chairman
X	Leslie Daigle, Council Member
X	Don Webb, Council Member
X	Barry Eaton, Planning Commissioner
X	Robert Hawkins, Planning Commissioner
X	Michael Toerge, Planning Commissioner

Advisory Group Members Present:

	Mark Cross
	Larry Frapwell
	William Guidero
X	Ian Harrison
X	Brion Jeannette
	Don Krotee
X	Todd Schooler
	Kevin Weeda
	Dennis Wood

Staff Representatives:

X	Sharon Wood, Assistant City Manager
E	David Lepo, Planning Director
X	Leonie Mulvihill, City Attorney
X	James Campbell, Principal Planner
X	Gregg Ramirez, Senior Planner
X	Melinda Whelan, Assistant Planner

E = Excused Absence

Committee Actions

1. **Agenda Item No. 1** – Approval of minutes for December 16, 2009.

Action: Committee approved draft minutes.

Vote: Consensus

2. **Agenda Item No. 2** – Draft Zoning Code Review and Processing

Action: The Committee reviewed Committee Member Eaton's comments and provided the following action and suggestions:

- Pg. 1-4 Section 20.10.040 C. – at the end of the first sentence strike “in the absence of” and insert “except”
- Pg. 1-5 Section 20.10.050 B.1. – reinsert “all”
- In all residential development standards tables, remove reference to Section 20.48.180 (Open Space) out of the Additional Requirements column and use a footnote as a reference instead.
- Pg. 2-19 Section 20.20.010 C. – strike “limited”
- Pg. 2-24 Table 2-5 – in the Commercial Corridor (CC) zoning district, allow Maintenance and Repair Services as a permitted use
- Pg. 2-30 footnote (3) – re-write to clarify and change throughout
- Pg. 2-31 Section 20.22.010 E. – possibly reconstruct second to last sentence
- Add a definition for “Parking Facilities”
- Add Research and Development as a permitted use in the all mixed use zoning districts
- Pg. 3-9 Section 20.30.040 A.2. – revise the second sentence to say: “ A minimum horizontal separation equal to the height of the tallest retaining wall shall be provided, except that the required separation shall not be greater than 6 feet. Also, provide a procedure for discretionary relief (ZA) from this regulation
- Pg. 3-9 Section 20.30.040 C.- strike “fence” and insert “guardrail” after 42-inch
- Committee Member Hawkins objected to exempting City projects from the provisions of the Zoning Code

Action: The Committee requested that staff look into the following items and report back:

- Revise the open space definition or the use of the term “open space” to be clear as to what we are requiring – staff will provide clarification and maybe change the name to “building modulation”
- Pg. 2-62 D.6.Ocean Blvd./Breakers Drive – review with Advisory Member Brion Jeannette and propose revised section and revised related map at the next meeting
- Pg. 3-21 Section 20.30.070 – look into revising some of the language to make it clear that the intent is not to create nonconformities especially for the auto dealerships and the requirements for certain types of lighting and bring back examples of the foot-candle measurements that are being proposed
- Pg. 3-19 D.4. Chimneys and vents – staff will verify with the Building Department that these provisions are accurate

Public Comment on this item:

- Carol McDermott stated that she will provide minor suggestions, in writing, to staff. She indicated that there is no definition of “parking facilities”. Staff will add a definition. She also noted the addition of development standards for the PI Zoning District and would like to meet with staff to discuss. She also explained that she did not want the lighting standards to create unnecessary nonconformities especially for the auto dealerships.
- Tom Matthews expressed concern with the new requirement for residential to provide both parking spaces within a garage. Regarding Section 20.30.130 Figure 3-7 for the Traffic Safety Visibility Area, he questioned whether new buildings would lose square footage because of this requirement. Regarding outdoor lighting, he agreed that the types of lighting required should be further discussed and that a photometric study should always be required before large projects are approved. Also, he stated that relief needed to be added for retaining walls within areas that do not have sufficient horizontal area such as Mariners Mile where the 8-foot maximum height may not be the right number. He will provide more detail in writing to staff.
- George Schroder expressed concern with the new additional requirements for rear yards abutting an alley such as the ones found on pg. 2-13. He thinks the change will reduce maximum building area for certain sites and we should compensate in some other way, possibly on the third floor allowance. Staff will look into this.
- Jim Mosher wants the Committee to consider protecting private views, pg. 3-25 Section 20.30.100, as he feels they are an important part of the City.

3. Agenda Item No. 3 – Future meeting dates

The next meeting is scheduled for March 31.

Vote: Consensus

4. Agenda Item No. 4 – Items for future agenda

The meetings will continue with review of Part 4 of the third draft. Staff will also report back on the aforementioned items.

5. Agenda Item No. 5 – Public Comments on non-agenda items

None.

Agenda Item No. 6 – Adjourn - Meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.